DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 960 JC 980 013

AUTHOR	Milliron, Mark D., Ed.
TITLE	Leadership Abstracts, Volume 10.
INSTITUTION	League for Innovation in the Community Coll.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, MI.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	31p.
AVAILABLE FROM	World Wide Web: http://www.league.org/leadbast.html
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Leadership Abstracts; v10 n1-12 1997
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role; *Community Colleges; Cooperative Learning; *Educational Change; Educational Facilities; Educational Strategies; Educational Technology; Labor Force Development; *Leadership; *School Community Relationship; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Welfare Reform

ABSTRACT

The abstracts in this series provide brief discussions of issues related to leadership, administration, professional development, technology, and education in community colleges. Volume 10 for 1997 contains the following 12 abstracts: (1) "On Community College Renewal" (Nathan L. Hodges and Mark D. Milliron); (2) "The Community College Niche in a Competitive Higher Education Market" (Don Doucette); (3) "From Castles in the Air to Classrooms on the Campus: Using Collaborative Learning To Develop Facilities" (Lynn Sullivan Taber); (4) "Resources for Leaders" (Mark D. Milliron, Ed.); (5) "Both Sides Now: Perspectives on Community College Workforce Development" (Ruth G. Shaw); (6) "Community College Leadership in the Age of Technology" (Steven Lee Johnson); (7) "Building Community from the Inside Out" (Stephen K. Mittelstet and Gerardo E. de los Santos); (8) "The Purpose, Process, and Product of the Learning Revolution in the Community College" (Terry O'Banion); (9) "Embracing the Tiger: The Institutional Effectiveness Challenge" (John E. Roueche, Laurence F. Johnson, and Suanne D. Roueche); (10) "The Addictive Organization and the Community College" (Sheila Ortega); (11) "Providing Short-Term Educational Programs: Welfare Reform and One-Stop Centers" (Alice Villadsen and Nick Gennett); and (12) "High School Ain't What It Used To Be" (Sandy Acebo). (BCY)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 413 960

Leadership Abstracts

Volume 10, Numbers 1-12, 1997

Mark D. Milliron
Editor

League for Innovation in the Community College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Doucette

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JC 980013

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

ON COMMUNITY COLLEGE RENEWAL

Nathan L. Hodges and Mark D. Milliron

Modern community college leaders operate in a time of never-before-seen uncertainty and change. On a macro level, community college administrators are facing massive fluctuations in national, state, and local economies; wide legislative swings; significant demographic shifts; and expensive and seemingly unending technological improvements. On the local level, state system priorities, board changes, faculty unions or associations, and a host of other quandaries, vie for attention and action. What is offered here is a simple framework for taking on these challenges without drowning in a sea of trendy acronyms or "cutting-edge" organizational theory—a framework based on the basics of organizational renewal.

A Renewal Framework

Strategies for dealing with uncertainty and change have taken many forms over the last ten-to-fifteen years. Some of these strategies include terms and acronyms common to most in community college administration: management by objectives (MBO), transformational leadership, systems theory, total quality management (TQM), continuous quality improvement (CQI), quantum quality (QQ), seven habits, learning organizations, reengineering, downsizing, and rightsizing. New and interesting alternative ideas are also advanced by advocates of chaos theory, "the new science," liberation management, and those that tell us to "lead from the soul." Much to the dismay of the leader who feels comforted by the number of choices, many of these perspectives seem to discount the others and at times mock the very tenets of rival theories. In addition, some approaches draw so much wrath from faculty or staff that, while the basic ideas may be worthwhile, the resulting internal contention is not worth the adoption. This state of affairs leaves many community college leaders unable to decide what perspective, or which acronym for that matter, to "buy-in" to.

Trice and Beyer, in their work on organizational cultures, make the claim that new organizational perspectives and leadership theories will constantly emerge and develop as the sands of time, context, and priorities continue to shift. They go on to argue that the whole process of developing and adopting these perspectives is all part of a *rite of renewal*, a natural process necessary for survival in changing times. However, in a community college, the adoption of these perspectives, techniques, tools, or "paradigms" is sometimes so individually time consuming or organizationally traumatic that it is difficult to justify even the most worthwhile move in a new direction. Even more disturbing is that the enthusiasm of the advocates is often met with outright defiance over terminology such as "customer" or over the use of a given metaphor in an educational setting (e.g., business metaphors, industrial models, or new-age philosophies). Nonetheless, with the ever-increasing pressure of constant change, leaders cannot maintain the status quo and survive; they must take some kind of action.

In a conversation about quality initiatives some years ago, a colleague offered some sage advice that relates to these issues and inspired the concept presented here. He said, "The trick is to do TQM-like things without ever calling it TQM; you get less resistance and more results that way." That conversation, combined with the idea of the inevitability of organizational renewal, led to the development of this simple framework for dealing with the dual challenges of massive change and divergent and often competitive strategies for dealing with change. The framework is formed by adhering to the following directives: (1) get grounded, (2) get real, and (3) get going.

Get Grounded

As most organizations are prodded or pulled toward renewal because of constituent needs, external events, or visionary leaders, the process somehow either explicitly or implicitly brings into question the very foundation of the organization. What is it about? To what are the people committed? Organizational members begin asking, "Why do we do what we do the way we do it?" This prodding and these questions relate to the idea of getting grounded. At some point, organizational members must explore these basic issues and come to some agreement. While constructive conflict is important, it rarely has any impact without the eventual development of some collective purpose.

Techniques for grounding have been suggested by various organizational renewal perspectives and are in practice in many community colleges. Examples include community colleges that have engaged in strategic

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

visioning sessions with their boards, community members, administrators, faculty, and staff. Others embrace exploring core paradigms and developing detailed vision/mission statements and goal lists. Some hold retreats and explore personality types, conflict styles, or communication profiles. Still others engage an elaborate collegewide process to get at core beliefs and values. Colleges often keep records of these processes in strategic plans or other documents.

Whether it's spawned by reading Covey, Senge, Wheatley, or Peters, each of these strategies, by whatever name, involves the essentials of getting grounded: individuals understanding themselves and their working styles; groups learning about working together; and, collectives coming together around common ideals and outcomes.

Without this grounding, organizations flounder and often do not have the fortitude to face the challenges found in major change. This being so, leaders are wise to spend the time necessary to understand and listen to their team, help all learn to work together well, meet individual and organizational needs, and develop a sense of collective purpose. This grounding is an essential first step before the organization prepares to get real.

Get Real

Organizational theories as early as scientific management have discussed the importance of getting good information on an organization to ensure a realistic chance of achieving individual and collective goals. From time-and-motion studies to statistical process control, from encounter groups to empathetic listening, renewal perspectives have advocated using information to get a clear picture or sense of the organization and its inputs, outputs, climate, culture, or even its soul.

To achieve these ends, some colleges are deep into institutional effectiveness and have developed elaborate systems to generate and analyze data about college operations. Others have adopted quality techniques ranging from statistical process controls to focus groups. Some colleges utilize marketing models and customer analysis. And, a number of institutions closely relate activities to accreditation and university transfer standards.

Given the public outcry for accountability (e.g., performance-based funding, student guarantees), our students' needs for lifelong learning, and our own need to adapt in a quickly changing world, having good information about what we do is vital. Community college leaders understand this; and, whether they favor quantitative or qualitative methods, process or product measures, they are engaged in a broad set of activities aimed at getting real. The key is to collect *useful* information that offers insight into how the college serves students, treats employees, and responds to the needs of its community. This process is essential because often an honest assessment of the past and present is the key to successful moves into the future. Thus, in any renewal effort, however difficult the technique or displeasing the data may be, leaders neglect getting real at their own peril.

Get Going

Community colleges across the country are decorated with framed vision, mission, and goal statements. Almost any president can pull from their shelf the most recent strategic or long-range plan. In addition, state-system printouts and institutional research reports often fill the cabinets of administrators, faculty, and staff. However, to move from getting grounded and real to meaningful organizational renewal a leader must get going—he or she must take these materials and do something with them.

The importance of having an action orientation is one of the most consistent findings in leadership and organizational theory for the past 80 years. From Mintzberg to the *Fifth Discipline*, renewal perspectives tout the importance of doing something once a team is together and motivated, using collected information in some meaningful way, and taking steps toward actualizing collective visions, missions, or goals.

Savvy leaders notice the connection between follow through and credibility in future renewals. If a CEO spends the time, effort, and money of an organization on an involved renewal process (e.g., adopting TQM or implementing writing across the curriculum), and then fails to take action, the resulting lack of credibility can cripple the most able administrator 's ability to respond to future change. A personal mentor's voice rings at this point with his favorite phrase, "in every project you're a part of, follow up, follow up, follow up!"

Conclusion

Most leaders will readily recognize the processes of getting grounded, getting real, and getting going in what they currently do. Consequently, this framework is not meant to supplant or discount any existing strategy for organizational renewal. Neither is it meant to add a new strategy to the renewal ranks. Rather, this framework is offered as a way of thinking about what leaders must do as they tackle the massive changes that daily come their way. It is further intended to afford leaders greater flexibility in subtly synthesizing multiple renewal strategies to shape approaches to change in a way that makes sense for their organizations. After all, when renewing an organization, rarely does one size fit all.

Nathan Hodges is president of Haywood Community College (NC); Mark D. Milliron is associate director of the League for Innovation

Mark D. Milliron, Editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691 (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[redacted] February 7, 1997

leadership abstracts

World Wide Web Edition February 1997 Volume 10, Number 2

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE NICHE IN A COMPETITIVE HIGHER EDUCATION MARKET

Don Doucette

Microsoft and Disney, as well as a host of other commercial providers, will soon deliver high-quality, accredited, college-level courses and programs to most homes and businesses. While this statement may seem bold, several technological, economic, social, and demographic trends lead directly to some version of this somewhat foreboding future.

Business and industry and the entire world of work continue to be transformed by the infusion of information technology. This transformation is leading to increased demand for education and training. Most analyses show that there is significant profit potential in delivering education and training to the expanding market of adult workers who need it to survive and prosper, to the increasingly price-sensitive market of more traditional-age students, and to those facing other access barriers, such as time and distance.

Given these expanding markets and the prediction that the technology required to affordably reach them is on the horizon, there is little doubt that companies like Microsoft and Disney will find ways to reach these learners in more effective, efficient, and engaging ways than current college and university systems. Moreover, the technophobia of most Americans will not be enough to stop them from buying and using a $500 TV that is really a computer hooked to the global information network. In short, as soon as a person on a couch with a remote control can easily access interactive instructional offerings, the education and training revolution begins.

So, how are community colleges to respond to these entries into the higher education market? What are community colleges to become when Michael Eisner, Bill Gates, Robert Allen, Ted Turner, Rupport Murdoch, John McGraw and others like them become, in effect, college presidents—CEOs of multinational information, communications, and education companies?

Institutional Scenarios

The effects of the coming changes in the technology and economics of higher education

CH_JC950044
PDAT_Jan95
LEVEL_1
TITLE_Selected Student Statistics, January 1995.
INST_ZQU97865=Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, Madison.
PUBTYPE_110; 143
GEO_U.S.; Wisconsin
GOV_State
DESC_Community Colleges; Two Year Colleges; *Enrollment; Data (Tables); *Full Time Equivalency; *Student Characteristics; *Enrollment Trends; School Districts; *Two Year College Students; Males; Females; Ethnic Groups; Age
IDEN_*Wisconsin Technical College System
ABST_Providing data on headcount enrollment for the Wisconsin Technical College System, this report contains tables of system-wide enrollments, district enrollments, and enrollments by selected characteristics for 1992-93 and 1993-94, as well as historical data from the past 10 years. First, a map of Wisconsin college districts is provided and categories of aid code titles used are defined as college parallel; postsecondary, including associate degree and vocational students; and continuing education, including vocational-adult and community services education. The following tables, showing data by these categories, are then provided: (1) statewide enrollment, 1984-85 through 1993-94; (2) total enrollment by district for 1992-93 and 1993-94; (3) full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment by district for 1992-93 and 1993-94; (4) selected student characteristics, including age, gender, and highest grade completed for 1992-93 and 1993-94; (5) selected student characteristics by district; (6) statewide target population enrollment (e.g., students with disabilities, academic or economic disadvantages, and with limited English proficiency) for 1984-85 through 1993-94; (7) district target population enrollment, 1992-93 and 1993-94; (8) statewide enrollment by race/ethnicity, 1984-85 through 1993-94; (9) district enrollment by race/ethnicity, 1992-93 and 1993-94; (10) enrollment by county of residence, 1992-93 and 1993-94; and (11) student transfers to system districts, 1992-93 and 1993-94. (KP)

will not be uniform. Colleges will fare better or worse depending upon type, cost, curricula, and admission standards—that is, depending upon their market niche. A number of published reports by authors exploring the future of higher education in an age of technorevolution—most notably Eli Noam's Electronics and the Dim Future of the University published in Science this past summer—can be used to predict the prospects for different types of institutions. These institutional predictions are based on the argument that the information technology explosion will reverse the flow of information. No longer will students be obliged to "go to" the information as is the case in the traditional higher education model. In the future, students will be able to access information from almost anywhere.

Research Universities

Electronic communications will be a mixed blessing for research universities. The explosion of information and its distribution will make the research and knowledge validation function more important than ever. More problematic will be maintaining universities as physical islands of research, since physical proximity of scholars may become less important. To the extent that aspiring scholars wish to locate in physical proximity to scholarly activity, the teaching function of the research university may be maintained. It will be an outgrowth of the research function and benefit a few select students who will be asked to pay much higher costs for the privilege of being taught by noted scholars. However, the university's role in mass undergraduate education will be diminished, having profound and disruptive effects on these generally large institutions with massive physical infrastructures.

Liberal Arts Colleges

The prospects for liberal arts colleges and other small colleges are somewhat more dicey. Having no appreciable research and knowledge validation function, these institutions have always depended upon high-quality teaching as their reason for being. Much like the elite universities, only those liberal arts and small colleges that are able to provide a high-quality educational experience for a dedicated constituency that can support high costs (such as religious denominations, corporations, or professional associations) will thrive.

Regional and Nonselective Colleges and Universities

Because the most negative impacts of electronic communications will be on mass undergraduate and professional education, nonselective universities which traditionally serve this market niche have the most precarious prospects. Without access to the scholars of the research university and without the benefit of the small size of the liberal arts college, these universities will become marginal in meeting the needs of their current students when degrees can be earned at home or extension centers. Their costs will rise so that they will not enjoy a price advantage over electronically delivered degrees. Only those regional universities that differentiate their missions and specialize in areas of great concern to sponsoring entities (such as state governments) will survive.

Community Colleges

The prospects for community colleges are mixed. On the one hand, because they currently perform the mass undergraduate education function that is most under pressure from electronically mediated alternatives and for-profit providers, their hold on the adult worker market in transfer and general education will be weakened, presenting a major threat to institutional viability. However, those community colleges that have high-quality technical education and training programs will prosper. Least affected by electronic forms of higher education will be skills training that requires hands-on instruction and feedback, which

comprehensive community colleges have a long history of providing.

Community colleges also have been on the forefront of experimenting with technology and other alternative delivery systems to accommodate the schedules of nontraditional students. However, while these efforts may buy time, it would be foolish to think that community colleges will ever be able to compete successfully with Microsoft and Disney in providing high-quality multimedia or electronics-based higher education and training. In the mass-undergraduate higher-education market, community colleges will lose any head-to-head competition with these corporate giants.

The Community College Niche

Rather than compete, community colleges must embrace their commitment to supporting learners. The principal clientele of community colleges have little access to selective liberal arts colleges or other environments that nurture small communities of learners. However, these same students are arguably most in need of learning assistance. In addition, while some community college students will be able to enroll in and successfully complete courses offered through pay-per-view, most will need support in order to benefit from these high-tech facilitated offerings. That support is likely only to be available through local community colleges.

Consequently, community colleges will prosper if they do what they do best: provide high-quality support services to help students learn—regardless of where they get their information. In some cases, community colleges may become brokers of content supplied by for-profit providers, wrapping a learning-support environment (e.g., faculty consulting, testing centers, academic advising, new-student and specific-subject orientations) around the content that students receive in their homes or businesses. On a serendipitous note, the development or fine tuning of this learning-support infrastructure will better position the community college to serve all students, whether their content source is the Learning Channel or traditional in-house instruction.

In other words, the community colleges that will survive the frontal assault waged on their mission by information-age higher-education providers will be those who understand their niche as learning colleges. As Terry O'Banion describes in his soon-to-be-published book, The Learning College, these colleges will shed their role as disseminators of information in favor of the role of champions of learning. They will draw upon years of experience in student support services, developmental education, and personalized instruction to become the best learning-support organizations in the world. Disney and Microsoft cannot compete in the provision of these services.

Conclusion

This future for community colleges is not so much defined by the application of information technology as it is driven by it. Community colleges will not find their market niche by trying to transform themselves with technology to compete with major commercial providers. Instead, community colleges must make their mark by understanding learning and delivering upon the long-held promise to support students as they take on their unique learning challenges.

As much as community college leaders might lament the changes that are being forced upon their institutions by information technology, they must admit there is a delightful irony at hand. Market forces are pushing community colleges to perfect the role that it has always been their destiny to play—the role of premier learning institution, providing universal access to high-quality lifelong learning for all. Maybe Disney U and Microsoft University are not so bad after all.

Don Doucette serves as vice chancellor for education and technology for the Metropolitan Community Colleges in Kansas City, Missouri. This abstract summarizes his keynote remarks at the League for Innovation's Conference on Information Technology held in Phoenix in November 1996.

Volume 10, number 2
February 1997

☞Voice: (714) 367-2884 ☞FAX: (714) 367-2885

Return to the **Leadership Abstracts** Page

This page has been accessed 44 times since February 7, 1997.

©1997, The League for Innovation in the Community College
Added to the World Wide Web: February 7, 1997. *Last updated: February 7, 1997*

Leadership Abstracts Editor: Mark D. Milliron. Please send e-mail to:*Milliron@League.org*
Webmaster: Dan Solarek. Please send e-mail to:*dsolarek@League.org*

leadership abstracts

FROM CASTLES IN THE AIR TO CLASSROOMS ON THE CAMPUS: USING COLLABORATION TO DEVELOP FACILITIES

Lynn Sullivan Taber

Most community college physical plants are over 25 years old and in need of maintenance, renovation, or new facilities. A 1995 study by the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers and the National Association of College and University Business Officers found that deferred maintenance needs had increased in 52 percent of community colleges in the past six years. On average, each college's deferred maintenance was equal to $4.8 million, or 28 percent of annual revenue. Almost half of the total two-year college space had been neither constructed nor renovated since 1975. Shrinking state allocations, the growing percentage of colleges' budgets allocated to personnel-related costs (80 to 87 percent for most two-year colleges), and increases in construction or renovation costs combine to make purchase, renovation, or building new facilities difficult. These data explain the recent survey finding that 36 percent of college administrators list facilities concerns among their most pressing challenges.

Recent studies show that several community colleges are meeting their facilities needs through partnerships with private and public entities. For most trustees, presidents, and other college leaders, however, developing these partnership agreements and fiscal arrangements is uncharted territory. Not surprisingly, the resulting apprehension and uncertainty inspired by these arrangements often ensure that the benefits of collaboration remain as "castles in the air" and never materialize into classrooms on the campus.

To address this apprehension and uncertainty and to provide a realistic perspective on what is possible, the following sections provide a practical look into some challenging aspects and interesting examples of collaborative facilities resource development in community colleges.

Challenging Aspects

Difficulties encountered during collaborative resource development typically fall into one-of-two categories: (1) structural challenges and (2) relationship challenges. Working through these challenges with foresight, creativity, realism, caution, and good legal counsel is essential to quality collaborative facilities resource development.

Structural Challenges

Most state regulations governing construction were not written with collaborative arrangements in mind. This situation creates the need to lobby legislatures to write new laws or to modify those in place and to work closely with state boards of education to clarify the need, requirements, and potential liabilities, so that intelligent and sound decisions may be made. While the length of time for state approval processes varies, it is not unusual to hear administrators talk about three, six, or ten years having passed since their first request for approval and allocation. When noneducational entities have resources to share, chances are good that the offer will not remain open for a long time. Thus, traditional state processes can jeopardize district and state opportunities for generating additional facilities resources.

Bidding laws also may come into play. Ethically and financially sound ways must be found to allow the standard bidding processes to be suspended or modified in certain cases. As an example, some colleges have been approached by independent entities bringing resources and wanting to develop facilities partnerships; but current laws, policies, and procedures have impeded timely responses by the colleges. In California, special concerns about earthquake safety standards (the Field Act) make it nearly impossible to purchase existing commercial or industrial buildings, which could generate substantial savings for community colleges.

Not all states roadblock facilities partnerships. Illinois, for example, is currently providing incentives to encourage collaborative activities, and Florida has laws in place that manage the development of collaborative efforts between community colleges and other entities.

Relationship Challenges

Beyond challenges arising from state governing bodies and laws, today's community college facilities collaborators face unknown territory when they are working with the people developing those collaborative relationships; encountering different organizational cultures, assumptions, and missions; and confronting many practical problems when building or renovating facilities for community college use. A clear, common mission is mandatory. The group's work energy must

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

be harnessed and guided in a single direction to avoid becoming derailed. All parties should "put on the table" what they expect to gain from their association and what they plan to contribute. Partnerships require mutual dedication, participation, and contributions. College representatives must be given authority to operate within guidelines the president and board decide are appropriate, and must allow independence and difference to coexist in the group. Each conversation has the potential for misunderstanding or disagreement, or as has been stated, "Each point of contact in a network can be a source of conflict as well as harmony."

Partners must specify the details of the arrangement before finalization. Following are some of the components that should be addressed; these matters vary with the unique nature of each project. What are the exact characteristics of the financial arrangement? Is the contribution a gift? Does one partner expect services or items in return for his or her organization's contribution of assets? How long will the relationship last?

The following questions need to be answered as well to maintain positive and productive relationships throughout collaboration: "Who will pay what, to whom, under what circumstances, and for how long? What are the penalties if this agreement is breached?" When constructing a shared-use building, the agreement should address many eventualities, as the building will likely remain in place for a number of years. Specific roles and responsibilities of participating individuals and offices must be clarified. Liabilities for the organizations and individuals must be made clear before the final signatures are affixed. No detail of the relationship should remain unaddressed, and legal counsel must be consulted.

Interesting Examples

Several community colleges have braved these challenging aspects and have collaborated with other entities to create *libraries and learning resource centers, higher education complexes, mixed-use centers, joint-use recreational facilities,* and to use *retail or other commercial spaces* for programs and services. Metropolitan Community College in Nebraska has been engaging in discussions with Omaha libraries to develop a partnership where branch libraries would increase their holdings from the college's collection, and the college would gain needed instructional space. Illinois, Florida, North Carolina, and Texas are among the states currently experimenting with higher education complexes. The College of DuPage in Illinois is host to a multicollege-and-university center where baccalaureate and graduate programs are offered by public and private institutions to area citizens who would otherwise be unable to attend upper-division schools.

Some institutions help create mixed-use facilities that house educational programs and services and related noneducational activities. A new facility at the Cosumnes River College, California, called the Eldorado Education Center, will house the El Dorado County Office of Education, an elementary school, a child-care center open to the college and to county residents, and will provide a campus for 2,500-4,000 college students.

Joint-use recreational facilities have proved beneficial for some colleges. In the city of Irving, Texas, North Lake College (Dallas County Community College District), the Irving Independent School District, and the city built and operate an Olympic-quality swimming pool. This facility is host to community recreational swimming opportunities, high school and college swimming classes, as well as competitive activities.

Spaces not formerly thought of as "college material" may hold potential solutions for difficult facilities problems. Truckee Meadows Community College in Reno, Nevada, sought off-campus classroom space and found open space in Reno's Old Town Mall. Mall management offered attractive rates to the college for second-floor space that now holds classrooms popular with students and faculty because of the location and the pleasant atmosphere.

Conclusion

The advantages of engaging these challenging aspects and exploring these interesting examples in collaborative resource development are very real. They include (1) reducing the dollar cost for each partner; (2) sharing of spaces other than classrooms to provide certain services or programs, such as cafeterias or bookstores, that are needed by customers; (3) mutual professional learning and support that occurs when partner entities commit to and work in such relationships; (4) sharing facilities so that efficiency is increased for each entity (as when one organization uses a facility during the evenings and the partner organization during the days); (5) obtaining access to a valuable location that might otherwise be unavailable; (6) providing more than one program or service to students in a single location—the "one-stop shopping" concept; and (7) fulfilling special needs such as accessing adequate parking, expensive recreational facilities, or libraries.

In short, careful collaboration clearly can help community college leaders move from dreaming of castles in the air to developing practical partnerships to expand and improve facilities available to college programs.

Lynn Sullivan Taber is assistant professor of higher education administration at The University of Alabama. Taber is the coauthor with John and Suanne Roueche of the 1995 Community College Press Publication, The Company We Keep: Collaboration in the Community College. She can be contacted by e-mail at LTaber@bamaed.ua.edu.

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

BOTH SIDES NOW: PERSPECTIVES ON COMMUNITY COLLEGE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Ruth G. Shaw

Soon after leaving the presidency of Central Piedmont Community College to join Duke Power Company almost five years ago, it became clear that leaving meant *really* leaving. After being involved in community college education for more than 20 years—a career that was as much a calling as a profession—there came a painful realization. To continue to keep one foot in the community college world would mean never securing footing on a new path.

Leaving meant being out of touch with many of the issues that shaped the community college agenda for the past several years, as the events of "the other side" demanded my attention. The "other side" being the world of private enterprise where many educators have ventured only briefly, if at all. The lessons learned in this new context have altered some personal views on what community colleges must do to prosper—even survive—in this time of turmoil, transition, and transformation.

Unchanged, however, is a personal belief that community colleges are better positioned and prepared than any other segment of public education to respond to the dramatic challenges of workforce preparation. What has changed is the level of confidence that this advantage will be enough for the businesses that are hiring; enough for the students who want to enroll; enough for the taxpayers who subsidize community colleges; and enough to ward off the competitors who look at workforce preparation and see a multibillion dollar market ripe for the taking.

What is offered here are some perspectives on how experience on the other side has led to a certain conviction that the educational sector must move more quickly, with more customer focus, more quality, more cost-effectiveness, and more demonstrable results if it is to fulfill its economic and societal role. This experience is marked by revolutionary legislative change, rising customer expectations, fierce new competitors, widespread industry consolidation, and a profoundly changed work environment. Change may come in a different form to community colleges and workforce training, but the drivers and dynamics of the change will be similar, which means the lessons learned on this side may have application for community colleges.

Life on the Other Side

Most community colleges have short histories, with many springing up in the 1960s or early 1970s. America's electric utilities are older, with most dating to near the turn of the century. Both were founded on revolutionary ideas that would literally transform America. Community colleges were predicated on the idea of universal access to higher education. Electric utilities set out to harness the energy locked in rivers and coal to power the nation. Both have had effects far beyond those their founders envisioned; both have distinctly American roots.

Duke Power had its beginnings in 1904, as the indomitable Buck Duke set out to tame the mighty Catawba River to bring industry to Piedmont North Carolina and South Carolina. Today, this electric utility serves nearly 5 million residents in the two Carolinas. Our 100 thousand shareholders own more than 200 million shares of common stock, with a market capitalization of approximately $9.5 billion. Duke Power has approximately $5 billion in annual revenues.

Community colleges measure their size in enrollments or FTEs. Electric utilities measure themselves in generating capacity, and Duke Power is a big one—18,000 megawatts. To put that figure in perspective, at peak demand, Duke generates enough electricity to power three cities the size of Los Angeles every day.

Major Change Comes Duke's Way

When first joining Duke Power Company, a friend in the banking industry flatly stated that the utility business was one in which he could never work. He had been riding the surging tide of change in banking, and he saw electric utilities as stodgy, gray-faced, slow-moving, and downright boring. And up until 1992, he was probably right. But in November of that year, Congress passed the Energy Policy Act, and competition arrived for those stodgy utilities. Transmission lines were "opened up" to carry electricity for all providers at fees reflecting actual cost. For the first time ever, wholesale customers could *choose* their electricity provider.

To put this change in perspective, it is as if a community college president woke up one day and discovered that instead of allocating state and local tax dollars to his or her institution, these dollars would be allocated directly to the students themselves, who could then choose any provider of education they wished to deliver the services they needed. What's more, any provider would have access to public college facilities at a fixed rate, as long as there was capacity.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

"For profit" purveyors of education could use community college production studios, learning resource centers, computer labs, classrooms, and distance learning networks. While the comparison is not perfect, it describes very well what is happening to electric utilities today.

Many in the electric utility industry thought this day would never come. Many are still fighting it. But the war is already over. Why? Because customers wanted one-stop energy solutions. Because customers demanded the value they believed competition would bring. Because industry found the disparities in the price of electricity in this country incomprehensible.

For example, customers pay an average of 14 cents per kwh in New Jersey and a nickel in Idaho. The miracles of technology and the ability to manage by data make rate disparities between a widget plant in Walhalla, South Carolina, and one in Wickatunk, New Jersey, stick out like a sore thumb. There is no mystery to it—and no explanation that satisfies the customer.

America has what is inarguably the finest, most reliable, most extensive, and most cost-effective system of providing electricity on the planet. It has operated well for decades and is the envy of much of the world. There is an established system of state and federal regulation to protect consumers, the environment, safety, and more. Billions of dollars have been invested by shareholders to create this system, based on a regulatory compact that created an obligation to serve in the assigned territory. Electricity, perhaps more than anything else you can name, is an essential service. Our economy, indeed, our very lives depend on it. But the electric utility industry is changing anyway—and many believe that a great system will be better in a competitive environment.

From Electricity to Education: Three Lessons from the Other Side

America's community colleges are inarguably the finest in the world. They too have operated well for decades, with tuitions and tax subsidies carefully regulated. They too are envied by those in other countries; they get more educational value for the dollar than any other public education sector. Billions of dollars have been invested by taxpayers based on the promise of access to higher education for all. But when you hear the story of the electric utility industry, know that change—through legislation or through competition of a sort you never imagined—can happen. It can happen because of demands for easier access, demands for similar pricing and packaging across the nation, demands for "mass customization," demands for more flexibility in choosing course segments, and demands for results. Community college leaders must decide whether their current systems can meet these demands—or whether they need to shape fundamental changes to keep pace. It requires vision and real risk taking.

Duke Power began shaping its future when then-chairman Bill Lee came to the radical conclusion that competition *would* be good for customers. In the face of the slow-moving, risk-averse, entrenched brotherhood of the electric utility industry, Duke waged a lonely battle in support of legislation to introduce competition. The company broke ranks, violated the fraternity rules, and made a difference. Why? Because Bill Lee believed the existing system could not endure. It could not deliver what the customers demanded. He knew the advent of competition would be difficult, even painful; for the company his grandfather had helped create. But he worked for the change, because he was convinced that ultimately the customers, shareholders, and employees would be the better for it.

A fundamental lesson, then, is to do what you know is right to bring change to your business. Have the courage to work for change that may seem to wreak short-run havoc on your institution, if it results in doing the right thing for your customers. In the process, look for the unlikely partners—even those you may see as competitors for scarce resources. Often these unlikely partnerships are the best route to meeting your unique challenges.

Community colleges do not behave very differently from electric utilities. Both wage battles for revenue increases (e.g., rates or funding), curry favor with influential government agencies (e.g., utility commissions or state boards of education), and lobby the legislature with the same old perennial agenda. However, as stable as the environment may seem, things can and will change. Community college leaders can shape the form of these changes but cannot avoid them. Whether community colleges undergo the tsunami that electric utilities are experiencing, or a slightly less dramatic tidal wave, the following lessons from the other side should help in shaping this change.

Lesson One: Focus on the Customer

Customer focus is the bedrock of success in a competitive world. While some in the community college world may not like the terminology of "customer," colleges do, in fact, have constituencies they serve: students, employers, transfer institutions, and society at-large. Regardless of the terminology, it is likely that these constituencies are demanding the very things they are demanding from electric utilities: flexibility, customization, value, ease of access, speed, low cost, and no hassle. And, with the doublepunch of information technology and globalization creating broader and more elaborate customer expectations, these demands will continue to press on the open door. Community college leaders ignore them at their peril.

Electric utilities used to be one of the worst institutions in responding to customer needs. Today, however, because of competition and quality concerns, electric utilities are wooing customers in ways they never imagined. Advertising campaigns, special deals, free gifts, and "green power" are just some of the techniques Duke has engaged to tailor packages that give customers what they want.

Community colleges have prided themselves on being student centered for years—and, for the most part, justifiably so. However, even the best community colleges become a little campus-centric. Take the term "distance education."

From whose perspective is distance defined? From a learner perspective, he or she is never "closer" to learning than when sitting at the home computer, engaged in on-line conversations with people around the world, accessing volumes of information on the Internet, or reviewing a multimedia learning module. It is learning that is convenient, accessible, and lively; there is nothing "distant" about it. Distance education could be better defined as having to drive 20 miles to a campus and then having to walk a half mile to the classroom. In short, seeing through the customers' eyes can make a difference.

Much like the public utilities of ten years ago, community colleges have operated in a world of little real competition. Today, however, students are choosing other educational options even though community college offerings are cheaper and often of higher quality. Whatever community college educators think of them, institutions like DeVry and the University of Phoenix have entered the market place. They are leaders in developing core competencies in the high-tech delivery of applied education. They are user-friendly, easily accessible, very affordable, and, above all, customer-focused. They are mastering many of the technologies community colleges pioneered and doing it on a grand scale. And, if broader competition comes to community college education in the form of vouchers or tax "scholarships," the stakes will be even higher and the competition more fierce. If this happens, will students select your institution or a competitor you have not even envisioned yet? While some may say that day will never come, they may want to talk with phone company and utility company executives who mouthed the same words not too long ago.

The market is too lucrative to pass up for those thinking about getting in the education business. For example, the past decade has been a period of extraordinary opportunity in workforce training. In the early 1980s, nearly 90 percent of corporate training was done in-house. Today fully 50 percent of corporate training is provided by outside contractors. Since American corporations spent $52 billion on upgrading skills in 1995, this is opportunity on a grand scale. Only a fraction is going to community colleges, whose strong corporate tax base should have them knocking on company doors to provide all the service they can. Other service providers suspect that many community colleges have poor marketing skills, the most superficial and episodic of major customer relationships, and little or no national vision. Speeches to the Rotary Club, glad handing at the chamber of commerce, and sending the continuing education dean around for an occasional visit come dangerously close to "best practice" in major customer relations at too many of our nation's community colleges. In the competitive world, this means you are ripe to be bid on, bought out, and boarded up.

Whether the mission and circumstances of your institution lead you to focus on the use of technology, on building stronger corporate training relationships, or on developing community-based programs in high-unemployment areas, be sure you are focusing on your customer. You will not serve them all. You can not serve them all. But where your priorities lie, you should surely serve them best.

Lesson Two: Quality Does Not Cost; It Pays

Jack Welch, the wonderfully quotable CEO of General Electric, is credited with this pearl of wisdom: "If the rate of change inside an institution is less than the rate of change outside, the end is in sight." The rate of outside change tends to leave us breathless these days, as we pitch into the trash more computing power than existed a few decades ago. Yesterday's military secrets—like microwave technology—are today's kitchen appliances. The advances are breathtaking, and it is a challenge for any organization to keep pace. At Duke Power, the basic agent for positive change in our company is quality management.

Please do not peg this suggestion as one straight from the pages of the corporate lexicon. Yes, "quality programs" have had their share of failures in business and in community colleges. Many of these failures have been based on fundamental misunderstandings of the quality process; many lacked sustained effort or adequate resources. But at Duke Power Company, the management principles set out in the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Criteria provided a tool for dramatic change and a yardstick to measure progress. They have made a significant difference in our company.

The core values and concepts are surely familiar: (1) quality is defined as consistently meeting customer expectations; (2) quality is measured by customer satisfaction, not self-gratification; (3) the overall objective is to meet customer expectations 100 percent of the time; (4) quality is attained through prevention and specific improvement projects; and (5) management commitment leads the quality process.

The systematic education and evaluation of our company around these principles has transformed it. We no longer measure ourselves against how good we were last year. We measure ourselves against the best in the business. And, we are not alone. The rate of improvement in managing utility operations has been so great that companies that were in the top quartile of performance a year ago are on the industry watch list today.

The question for community colleges is, "how will you improve quality when it is not only expected, it is necessary to survive?" Moreover, how will you measure results? Set your priorities? Communicate with customers? Use data? Develop faculty and staff? Realign your compensation system around quality outcomes? Develop new learning options? Improve financial performance? Benchmark against other community colleges?

While quality programs may be fraught with difficulty in process, they can lead to solid results and dynamic organizational action. Focusing on some method for defining vision, measuring results, and moving with purpose and quality will be the hallmark of the survivors of an expanding educational market.

Lesson Three: People's Uncertainty Around "Work" Is Profound—Help Any Way Possible

In the early seventies, the prognosticators told community college educators that one of the greatest challenges in the future would be to help people use their abundant leisure time as the miracles of automation led to shorter and shorter work weeks. Futurists imagined dividing the same work over the same people, with a rosy vision of an easier, more enjoyable life for all. Others, however, predicted a dire future with people destitute and useless while robots ruled the world.

What has happened is rather different than either picture painted twenty-five years ago. The advent of technology *has* altered the nature of work, but with different results. Duke Power has nearly 30 percent fewer employees today than it did a decade ago, largely because the tasks they once engaged are no longer necessary. And, as processes are refined, technology is further implemented, and cost efficiencies improved, uncertainty about what work will be available will likely increase—from top management to frontline workers. The changes that have impacted our work force could not be avoided; indeed, without them, the entire work force would not be needed as the company would likely not have survived. However, these changes have made us closely explore what "work" at Duke Power is all about.

Tenured faculty and certain government jobs might well be the only "secure" positions left—a security that is already being challenged. The old paternalism, protectionism, and the "work as family" paradigms are disappearing, if not already gone. As a result, many people are finding new futures in their own entrepreneurial businesses, or in the small businesses that are the fastest growing segment of the economy. Some are getting a new lease on life, exploring avenues they never imagined. Others, to be sure, are hunkered down and bitter, waiting for what might come next, feeling a deep sense of betrayal that the world has not worked out as promised. Too many are dissatisfied, stressed, and depressed. Sadly, many young people see little to attract them to the uncertain world their elders disparage.

Community colleges have a unique role in addressing these dynamics. Their charge is to help workforce entrants by training them well, teaching them meaningful skills, and helping them find the joy in working well at something that has meaning to them. Community colleges must be about more than preparing people for jobs—they must be about connecting people with personally engaging work.

Studs Terkel's classic ***Working*** speaks eloquently in the voices of working men and women. Kay Stipkin, who started a bakery cooperative in her neighborhood, shares her philosophy: "Work is an essential part of being alive. Your work is your identity. It tells you who you are. But it's gotten so abstract. People don't work for the sake of working. They're working for a car, a new house, or a vacation. It's not the work that's important to them. There's such joy in working well."

Yes, finding jobs is an issue; and economic insecurity is a reality. But if community colleges can help students find jobs that are also their "work," they are more likely to put students on the path to resilience, to internal motivation, to development that helps assure a career instead of a dead end, a life instead of just a living.

How can community colleges take on this challenge—a challenge that is beyond the private sector. For starters, they can help assure that those who are teaching have found *their* work and that their joy communicates to their students. They can be sure someone is listening, really listening, when a student talks about what he or she loves to do. They can be creative in helping students determine how to translate a love of low-riders into a love of work as an automotive technician or a love of babies into work as a child-care supervisor.

It is a world of work in which we must all think of ourselves as a business—a business in which we invest, a business we leave to our children through the legacy of our attitudes. But if we are to learn for a lifetime, to work for a decade longer than our parents, we need the help of community colleges—not just with developing skills, but with finding work that is our joy, work that leads us to living well.

Conclusion

It has been nearly five years since leaving the community college. Several friends were deeply shocked at the move into the private sector; personally, the move made perfect sense. I knew all along that I was really taking my work with me. Education *is* my work. It was just the job I left behind.

It is our work to continually improve the institutions to which we have devoted our time and dedicated our lives. These institutions—community colleges and businesses alike—are not just brick and mortar or dollars and cents, but the hopes and dreams of those we serve every day. True, our "customers" are not the same. But on both sides, the focus on understanding, satisfying, anticipating, even delighting customers is an imperative for success. Our management issues may not be identical either. But on both sides, the quality process can be a compass for navigating dramatic change, a useful discipline for continuous improvement. And, on both sides, finding a job is a way to make a living, while finding work is a way to make a life.

Ruth G. Shaw is senior vice president of Duke Power Company and former president of Central Peidmont Community College (NC). This article is based on a presentation given at the League for Innovation's annual "WORKFORCE 2000" Conference.

Volume 10, number 4
April 1997

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College

Printed on Recycled Paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP IN THE AGE OF TECHNOLOGY

Steven Lee Johnson

"Learning anytime, anyplace, anywhere, is the battle cry of the Learning Revolution;" this according to Terry O'Banion speaking during a special session at the 1997 American Association of Community Colleges' Convention. Ironically, at the same time authors, researchers, and leaders such as O'Banion lift the information technology banner as a means to this end, many community colleges continue to neglect or compartmentalize it. Whether through a lack of understanding or interest, some leaders literally give a technology department or division or team the power to make monumentally important decisions—decisions that will dictate the way their community college will operate for years to come—without ensuring that these decisions are placed in the broader context of improving or expanding learning options for students.

What is offered here is a set of useful principles for placing information technology in this broader context. The underlying assumption that drives these principles is that it is no longer functional to think in terms of "managing technology." Today's community college decision makers must take a step back and think in terms of *leadership in the age of technology.*

Principles for Leadership in the Age of Technology

In their recent book, *Winning through Innovation: A Practical Guide to Leading Organizational Change and Renewal,* Michael Tushman and Charles O'Reilly, III detail the challenges facing the leaders of modern organizations. Their exploration of technology change cycles and organizational alignment, coupled with Terry O'Banion's work on *The Learning College for the Twenty-First Century*, provide useful frameworks for community-college leaders and influenced the development of the following principles. While these principles can be used as a set of steps for planning and implementing information technology use, each is important in its own right in terms of leadership in the age of technology.

Burning Questions Start Fires

The search for quality use of information technology must begin by revisiting, refocusing, or recasting the mission of the college. By grounding information technology innovations upon the foundation of core mission, you ensure that discussions about hardware, software, and services do not degenerate into techno-babble, but stay focused on what the college is all about—learning.

One easy way to make sure this focus emerges early-on and continues throughout the process is to repeatedly ask the burning question: "How will this innovation improve teaching and learning?" Ask the question repeatedly. Ask it until team members giggle or groan—but do not let up. Others will follow the lead, and soon the spark ignited by the question will ignite a fire that members of the organization can carry with them into other arenas. With enough repetition and follow-through, you will make the burning question an integral part of the organizational culture.

Leaders Step into the Gaps

One of the main reasons organizations begin exploring their use of information technology is the perception of organizational performance gaps. For example, a faculty member comes to the dean and complains that the software in the physics lab is out-of-date; the registrar notes that web-based and phone registration would be more efficient than the long lines on registration day; a staff accountant cannot manipulate the financial information system to answer a question for the president. The perceivers can be quite persuasive in their advocacy for information technology solutions and in their demands for action; consequently, this is the time for the leader to step in.

Understanding and documenting the gaps between expected and actual performance is an appropriate task for a crossfunctional team. Empowering this team to identify gaps and relate them to core mission and critical outcomes will enable leaders to assess need and begin the process of planning for solutions. Often a technology solution is not the answer—maybe the staff accountant needs training on the finance system. But, without stepping into the gap, the leader would never know this.

Moreover, outside entities can heavily influence the performance gap perception. Information technology vendors collectively spend millions of dollars to promote technology solutions to problems that have little to no relation to the college's core mission. It is the leader's role to insure that the true priorities of the college, not the needs of the vendors, dictate the use of information technology.

The Best Solutions Are Based on Substance and Systems

After performance gaps are identified, one of the more common and dangerous occurrences is turning the problem over to the "technologists." While tempting because of the difficulty involved in keeping up with jargon and technical

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

specifications, a broader set of college staff must be involved. The broad teams involved should be encouraged to take a step back and explore solutions in relation to the systems in which they operate. For example, encourage the team not to explore web-based or phone registration in isolation. The team should research how these innovations relate to the broader system of student services and systemically analyze their effectiveness. Is the registration system the only system that should be explored? Perhaps not only technology-based solutions are necessary? Maybe the registration process itself needs to be streamlined?

Benchmarking is useful at this point. Talking with others in the same state or around the country who have already implemented or are in the process of implementing solutions to similar challenges is likely to provide insights into common problems and systemic issues not considered. Walking blind into information technology innovations is a trying process and should be avoided whenever possible. If it is necessary, be sure to work with the team to play out as many different scenarios as possible, while supporting as much research into solutions as necessary. Avoid statements such as, "the latest thing on the Internet said that X software was the best thing for our problem, we should try it!" Remind whomever makes a statement like this that, in addition to providing the best answer to the burning question, systems and substance must ground any solution proposed by the team.

Congruence Counts

Any proposed changes (technological or otherwise) must be checked for *alignment* with three important organizational factors. First, leaders must assess the fit between the proposed changes and the formal organization. For example, are there policy changes that need to be made? Will the new personnel required by the plan fit into the existing organizational structure?

Second, what are the human resource considerations necessary to implement the innovation? Web-based registration sounds wonderful, but without staff in the college who can design elaborate Web pages with forms that effectively interface with the data systems of the college, getting the innovation off the ground will be problematic. Recruiting the talent or beginning the training are the most frequent needs and should be considered early on.

The third and often the most important consideration involves the college's organizational culture. A common problem with TQM or process reengineering is that it ignores cultural values, norms, informal communication, and power relationships. Each of these cultural characteristics can completely cripple technology or institutional improvement initiatives. Care must be taken to involve the people who can make the improvement work, and for leaders across the organization to consistently reinforce the relationship of the proposed change to the organization's core mission of learning. Also, leaders must carefully consider how resistance to change will be forestalled or handled when it inevitably arises.

Acting Includes Adapting

Asking the burning question, analyzing performance gaps, basing solutions on systems and substance, and checking for organizational congruence all aim to place information technology actions and organizational innovations in the larger context of the core mission of the community college—facilitating learning. As solutions are engaged, policies might change, people may be trained, and power may be redistributed to enable the proposed solution to have the impact desired. Leadership is critical at this point, because modern information technology solutions span the entire institution and require the support of those in charge to make them happen. And, in best case scenarios, they are only a part of broader college initiatives and will have to fit into larger processes of reorganization or systems realignment.

Rigid support, however, of proposed solutions is the downfall of many information technology innovations. It is unlikely that you or your team anticipated all probable outcomes—particularly those relating to organizational culture. You may have to take more time to work with those involved to help them understand the need for change. Or, on a more practical level, the software may not work on the college's machines and will require outside help to complete installation. Being flexible and willing to adapt as the process unfolds will better prepare the organization to manage the current change initiative and others on the horizon. In short, see it through, but make sure the organization is with you on the other side when the process is complete.

Conclusion

The reality of modern community college leadership is that information technology innovations can and do span the entire institution, weaving through the fabric of the formal and informal organization. Technology change and innovation typically equals organizational change and innovation. Moreover, community college students are becoming more accustomed to information technology, and they expect the associated innovations to be a part of their educational experiences.

The dual challenge of today's community college leader, then, is to develop the kind of organization that can flexibly adapt to the information age and its rapid change while simultaneously maintaining a laser focus on the core mission—learning. The principles outlined here are offered to help meet this dual challenge and to move our institutions toward the ultimate goal of facilitating "learning anytime, anyplace, anywhere."

Steven Lee Johnson is vice president for administration at St. Petersburg Junior College (FL). His e-mail is slj400@msn.com.

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Printed on Recycled Paper

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

BUILDING COMMUNITY FROM THE INSIDE OUT

Stephen K. Mittelstet and Gerardo E. de los Santos

Much has been written about the need for community colleges to build community in our service areas by engaging external partnerships, economic development strategies, and community-based programming. There are, of course, excellent examples that illustrate the success of such efforts. Still, many community colleges find it difficult to connect with their external communities in meaningful ways. It is our observation that in a number of instances, one of the primary reasons for this struggle externally may well be that many of these same institutions lack a strong sense of internal community.

There are good reasons why building community in community colleges is problematic: (1) frequently our students are on campus for their classes only before or after rushing to jobs or from family; (2) most of our colleges are without residence halls, eliminating the opportunity for students to build community through true living/learning situations; and (3) most of our students only take a few classes before moving on to a job or a university, and thus never feel the sense of belonging that programs or college activities provide.

However, all these and other barriers notwithstanding, we are convinced that leaders in community colleges must do their utmost to build community on campuses, among campuses, in classrooms, and outside classrooms. Laying the foundation for this internal and external community building involves exploring several core issues. For example, does the vision and/or mission of the college clearly reflect community building as a sincere invitation, where students and employees feel welcome to contribute their many rich and diverse personal resources to the learning organization? Are the organizational values that unify a campus community defined, written, understood, shared, and practiced? Are strategies in place that communicate how the development and fostering of community building are to occur? Are the college's leaders, both inside and outside the classroom, pursuing their own individual journeys for authentic personal and professional behavior, as they seek the same for their students and coworkers?

The following sections detail the efforts of one college—Richland College in the Dallas County Community College District—to explore these issues and build their community. While there are a host of other good examples nationwide, the efforts outlined next provide a glimpse into building community from the inside out, which may inspire others to begin or continue similar efforts.

Building Internal Community

Start on Day One

At Richland College, one of the many efforts to integrate new employees into the campus community involves a comprehensive, long-term approach to new employee orientation. Acknowledging that orienting employees to a new working environment takes time, this orientation is a yearlong process that begins with a general session, which welcomes participants into the campus culture, helps them understand the college's mission and vision, and invites them to experience some of the college's community-building rituals. Nine subsequent topic-specific sessions, which track the mission-critical goals of the organization (one per month), are then conducted to give the new employee the opportunity to feel increasingly connected to the college community.

In addition to these sessions, each new employee is matched with a "veteran" college mentor. Mentors attend all orientation sessions with new employees and help them become comfortable in their new surroundings. This mentor role is not only useful for the new employee, but helps "reignite" veteran staff. Finally, during explorative focus groups, new employees are given time to share their fresh insights into the workings of the organization, to raise questions when what they observe seems to contradict the organizational values they have just learned, and to point out good examples of how the organization is or is not "walking the talk."

Enjoy the Process: Celebrate Together

Because the opportunity to educate diverse citizens and serve dynamic communities requires serious attention, many community college educators often disregard the practice of "fun" in the workplace. In order to create an environment where internal community building has the opportunity to blossom, incorporating "fun, joy, and laughter" into daily work is an encouraged and supported practice at Richland College. For example, during the Richland College Annual Faculty and Staff Fall Convocation, educators are reminded that "we take our work seriously together, while taking ourselves lightly." This attitude is not to trivialize the importance of our own personal journeys to lead authentic lives; it is a reminder that, as human beings, we can be pretty laughable and we, our students, and our organization can benefit by enjoying some of our foolish moments.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

In the same spirit, another aspect of building community is recognizing the accomplishments and contributions of those within the campus community. Over the years, the tradition of recognizing a deserving employee each month has captured the essence of "fun, joy, and laughter" for those who work at Richland College via the monthly "Outstanding Employee Parade." As festive marching music intended to attract more parade participants erupts, the college president leads a procession of Richland employees and students to a given work area to honor that month's colleague-selected employee. Bearing awards and lighthearted gifts for the honoree, a mass of parade participants "showers" the exceptional employee with praise and respect. Often, hugs of appreciation and tears of gratitude accompany this monthly tradition, which builds community in a most powerful way, merely by saying "thank you."

Building External Community

Creating Partnerships

As the needs of students, businesses, and community organizations within community college service areas continue to evolve, developing external community is imperative. One of the ways that community colleges build external community relates to supporting the economic vitality of the areas they serve. Through workforce development partnerships with the federal government via the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and the Dallas County Local Workforce Development Board, Richland College has created the Dislocated Workers Program, which retrains workers who have lost their jobs. This program serves economically disadvantaged workers (often single mothers who have very little training), as well as dislocated workers who are often the victims of company down-sizings and who need retraining. This program affords students the opportunity to search for work, enter a certificate program, or earn an Associate of Arts and Sciences degree. Not only are these disadvantaged and dislocated workers retrained, but most are placed in good paying jobs with local businesses, once again in a financial position to be better contributors to their various communities.

A Comprehensive Approach

Another means of building community externally is to create comprehensive programming that attracts different segments of the community to the college. Through community partnerships, Richland College has developed a comprehensive mind-body health program that serves to strengthen the links between its internal and external community. There are various program options designed to address the broad needs of the Richland College community: traditional intercollegiate athletics for highly skilled student athletes; intramural athletics for the average skilled athletes desiring fun and fitness; instructional academic programming which incorporates wellness into the college credit and continuing education programs via the Mind-Body Health curriculum; community, employee, and student memberships to the Fitness Center; and wellness programs for retirees and the physically challenged.

Building on the Strengths of Diversity

Building on the strengths of diversity within a community is an excellent way to build bridges of commonality between community groups and individuals. One of many programs at Richland College that exemplifies building on the strengths of diversity is the Emeritus Program. This program is designed for retirees who practice the community college value of lifelong learning. The mission of this program is *to provide affordable educational and community-building opportunities in which mature adults can: experience the joy and richness of lifelong learning, share their wisdom and experience with others, and continue to grow in mind and spirit.*

As a group of dedicated learners and community builders, Emeritus members volunteer their time and wisdom with Richland's English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) students through the program, "Conversation Partners." Emeritus members volunteer at least one hour a week to converse informally with ESL students who require understanding, patience, wisdom, humor, and caring as they learn the English language and find a place within their new community. These partnerships enhance intercultural and cross-generational understanding, as they promote new and special friendships.

Conclusion

Creating and sustaining strong internal community requires reflection, planning, implementation, and evaluation. The result of this methodical community building process will be what appears to others as a spontaneously celebrative and naturally supportive organizational culture. This strong foundation is essential to building the external community that our students, cities, states, and country need. Research and practice show that when we neglect the internal community, the comprehensive, caring, and quality educational and outreach progams at the core of a community-building college are correspondingly weakened. Consequently, community college leaders best position their institutions to achieve their complex missions by taking the steps and the risks necessary to build community from the inside out.

Stephen K. Mittelstet is the president and Gerardo E. de los Santos is special assistant to the president at Richland College. They can be contacted via e-mail at GED8110@dcccd.edu.

Special thanks go to Parker J. Palmer and Luke Barber whose works have significantly influenced the community-building culture of Richland College over the years.

Mark D. Milliron, Editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

THE PURPOSE, PROCESS, AND PRODUCT OF THE LEARNING REVOLUTION IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Terry O'Banion

The 1990s mark the spread of a Learning Revolution in higher education. In 1994, the cover of *Business Week* declared a learning revolution in progress; in 1995, a special section in *Time* announced the developing learning revolution. In 1996-97, the pace of the learning revolution picked up: the first national conference on "The Learning Paradigm" was held in San Diego; the Association of Community College Trustees released a special issue of the *Trustee Quarterly* devoted entirely to *The Learning Revolution: A Guide for Community College Trustees*; the American Council on Education and the American Association of Community Colleges jointly published *A Learning College for the 21st Century*. For the remaining few years of this century, "The Learning Revolution" will continue to be a leading theme of articles, books, conferences, commissions, studies,—and hopefully practices—in education.

This current revolution in education is part of a larger social transformation. Peter Drucker, in *Managing for the Future*, succinctly captures this special period of change: "Every few hundred years throughout Western history, a sharp transformation has occurred. In a matter of decades, society all together rearranges itself—its world view, its basic values, its social and political structures, its arts, its key institutions. Fifty years later a new world order exists. . . Our age is such a period of transformation." The Learning Revolution, "in a matter of decades," will fundamentally change the education enterprise. The revolution was triggered by the first wave of education reform launched in the early 1980s with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* and found its central theme in the second wave of education reform launched in the early 1990s. Substantive change is already beginning to appear in institutions of higher education as national associations and individual institutions begin to implement the revolution.

A Revolution with a Purpose

In a nutshell, the purpose of the Learning Revolution is to "place learning first" in every policy, program, and practice in higher education by overhauling the traditional architecture of education. In the 1993 book, *An American Imperative*, the Wingspread Group on Higher Education said "We must redesign all our learning systems to align our entire education enterprise for the personal, civic, and workplace needs of the twenty-first century." The Wingspread Group went a step further and indicated the challenge institutions of higher education will face if they are to implement the Learning Revolution: "Putting learning at the heart of the academic enterprise will mean overhauling the conceptual, procedural, curricular, and other architecture of postsecondary education on most campuses."

While there seems to be a revolution or reform movement about every decade in education, the Learning Revolution is quite different from reform efforts in the past. The Learning Revolution has two distinct goals: 1) to place learning first in every policy, program, and practice in higher education, and 2) to overhaul the traditional architecture of education.

Placing Learning First

Community colleges, for the most part, have positioned themselves as institutions committed to teaching. They take great pride in referring to themselves as "teaching colleges." *Building Communities*, the 1988 report of the Commission on the Future of the Community College, is a tribute to the community college's commitment to teaching: "Building communities through dedicated teaching is the vision and inspiration of this report"; "The community college should be the nation's premier teaching institution."

Because of its long commitment to teaching, the community college is the ideal crucible for the Learning Revolution. Every community college teacher wants to be a better teacher, and every community college teacher understands that the purpose of teaching is to help students make passionate connections to learning. These are bedrock values that will sustain and guide the Learning Revolution in the community college in the twenty-first century.

Overhauling the Traditional Architecture

Every faculty member and administrator in education has been frustrated at some time or another with the traditional architecture of education that limits how they can teach or manage and how students can learn. Roger Moe, former majority leader of the Minnesota State Senate, has said "Higher education is a thousand years of tradition wrapped in a hundred years of bureaucracy." The current system is time-bound, place-bound, efficiency-bound, and role-bound.

The system is *time-bound* by credit hours and semester courses. College students are learning in blocks of time that are artificial. Excellent teachers know that learning is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community Colleg
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundatio

not constrained to one-hour meetings held on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and they have been frustrated in teaching within these prescribed boundaries.

The system is *place-bound*. Learning is initiated, nurtured, monitored, and certified primarily by teachers in classrooms on a campus. We have experimented with distance education that takes courses off campus, but while it has increased student access, it retains the old model of education. Distance education, for the most part, is a nontraditional delivery system for traditional education. Work-based learning was supposed to break up that model, but it doesn't—it extends the model and is controlled by it because work-based learning is built around the current structure of the school. It still binds the student to a place.

The system is *efficiency-bound*. Our model of education reflects in great part the adjustment to an agricultural and industrial economy of an earlier era. Public school students are still dismissed early in the afternoon and in the summers so they can work on farms that no longer exist. Reflecting the industrial economy, education responded by creating a lock-step, put-them-in-boxes, factory model—the basis of American education today. Academic credit, based on time in class, makes learning appear orderly. This model creates an efficiency system to award credentials. Grades are collected and turned into credits, and these compilations are supposed to represent profound learning.

Finally the system is *role-bound*, which may be its greatest weakness. In education, we make the assumption that one human being, the teacher, can ensure that thirty very different human beings, one hour a day, three days a week for sixteen weeks, can learn enough to become enlightened citizens, productive workers, and joyful lifelong learners. Then we assume that this one human being can repeat this miracle three more times in the same sixteen-week period for ninety additional individuals. We provide little comfort and support when teachers fail to live up to this role-bound myth.

If we are to make any progress toward implementing the Learning Revolution, we need to replace the current educational system with a system designed for the kind of society in which we live, designed for the kinds of students who attend college, and designed to take advantage of what we know about new research on learning and about new applications of information technology.

Process and Product from Vanguard Colleges

A small vanguard of leading community colleges is beginning to experiment with new approaches to placing learning first and changing the historical architecture to implement new practices and programs to make its institutions more learning centered. These colleges are committed to institutionwide efforts to explore and implement the Learning Revolution, and they have begun to initiate activities and achieve outcomes that may be informative for other community colleges.

Process

As with any large-scale change initiative, *process* is as important as product. The process of launching a learning revolution at these institutions has included a host of key steps including: (1) building a critical coalition and involving all stakeholders; (2) creating an emerging vision of a learning-centered institution, which includes revised statements of mission and values that focus on learning; (3) fully supporting the initiative in word, deed, and dollars; (4) realigning current structures to accommodate collaboration and teamwork; (5) creating an open system of communication; (6) evaluating outcomes thoroughly; (7) committing to the long haul; and (8) celebrating changes and accomplishments.

The listing of these key elements does not do justice to the complexity of the task at hand or to the progress that this vanguard of colleges has made. They are only the first steps of a long journey that hundreds of community colleges are likely to begin in the next several years as they commit to becoming more learning-centered colleges.

Product

When the powerful purpose of the Learning Revolution combines with the thoughtful process of practitioners across the country, a clearer picture of the learning college will emerge. For now, the vanguard institutions point to some key characteristics of learning-centered colleges.

In short, learning-centered colleges are institutions where: (1) programs and services create substantive change in individual learners; (2) learners are engaged as full partners in the learning process, assuming primary responsibility for their own choices; (3) there are as many options for learning as possible; (4) learners are assisted in forming and participating in collaborative learning activities; (5) the role of learning facilitator is defined by the needs of the learner; (6) all college employees identify with their role in supporting learning; and (7) success is measured by documented, improved, and expanded learning for learners.

Conclusion

This revolution, guided by its core purpose of transforming education into a learning-centered enterprise, is quickly spreading across the community college landscape. As it continues, the closely connected process and product will necessarily develop and adapt to the needs of unique learning environments. Nevertheless, there is much to be gained from studying the efforts of those on the vanguard; and, much to be done as the revolution continues.

Terry O'Banion is the president and ceo of the League for Innovation in the Community College. More information on this topic is available in his most recent book, "A Learning College for the 21st Century," available through the Community College Press.

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

EMBRACING THE TIGER: THE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS CHALLENGE

John E. Roueche, Laurence F. Johnson, & Suanne D. Roueche

The current push for higher educational reform should neither be underestimated nor ignored. There is ample evidence that the current public criticism of colleges is not the temporary result of poor public relations, nor is it merely a pendulum swing toward public dissatisfaction that, with the passage of time or change of circumstance, will swing back toward better days. Although the last decade's groundswell of activities by elected and appointed bodies who inform and make policy to address poor performance has not produced significant and intrusive reform measures, there is an increasing body of evidence that colleges no longer can explain the criticisms away nor respond in halfhearted manner to public demands for educational reform. The goals that presently appear buried in college mission statements must become the driving forces behind improved accountability and effectiveness measures.

The data are clear; an institutional effectiveness "tiger" is stalking higher education. What follows is a look at this tiger and what embracing this tiger entails.

The Tiger's Tale

The North American public's love affair with institutions of higher education has taken a serious negative turn. These institutions are expected to "kiss back," to bring something substantial of themselves to this long-term relationship that many believe is currently too lopsided to survive without major change. This view challenges colleges to consider the reality of their current situation and requires them to take one of two positions: (1) They can offer no response to the scrutiny and the criticisms (or make halfhearted responses), assume that the public will eventually recognize that colleges are doing all and the best that they can, and do nothing more to meet their mission statement goals or earn the satisfaction of diverse constituencies; or (2) they can heed and respond earnestly to current calls for comprehensive assessment and evaluation of their efforts.

The dilemma in which they find themselves is inescapable and the subject of a recent study by Roueche, Johnson, Roueche, and associates that resulted in the book *Embracing the Tiger: The Effectiveness Debate and the Community College*. While there is ample information in more than a decade's worth of literature about criticisms and calls for reform, very little has been written about *how* and *how well* colleges are responding. That is not to say that opinions do not exist; they do. They appear in the literature, and they are mixed. Many observers and researchers say that colleges are not responding at all, or that college responses are not serious, or that their responses fall far short of the mark. Others report that serious responses are being made and that colleges are achieving appropriate effectiveness goals. In short, there is no consensus about the state of the effectiveness art.

While assessment of higher education is not new, the questions it generates currently are more intense, and larger numbers of individuals who have more power and authority to demand change are asking the questions and are involved in the discussions. In addition, as student populations grow more diverse and increase in size, there are exponentially more individuals available to criticize a college's performance. Taxpayers are more concerned that college programs utilizing tax dollars do so efficiently and effectively. And, as a body politic, U.S. governors argue that states should hold institutions of higher education publicly accountable and require that they measure student progress. Tennessee's performance-based funding, instituted more than a decade ago, led the way. Now Tennessee has been joined by other states currently developing policies requiring college plans for assessment, goal statements, and mandatory reporting of results to state authorities.

Presently, more than 13 state legislatures are discussing or implementing policies requiring a myriad of effectiveness measures—for example, measures that link student outcomes with funding, establish basic skills mastery tests, and document use of instructional space and faculty workloads. And, finally, although accrediting agencies have required that colleges institute accountability or assessment plans in order to earn accreditation, they are coming under fire. However, legislatures' close ties with the institutions they are supposed to regulate make them questionable watchdogs of the academy; and, moreover, their requirements do little to educate colleges about what and how they should be evaluating, to evaluate the quality of the resulting college data, and to improve on what many regard as a too lax self-reporting procedure.

Public distrust of higher education is at a new high. What many observe as an apparent mismatch between what America needs and what it gets from higher education is driving the design and production of "ability to benefit" legislation, strategies for measuring achievement, new standards of educational performance, and panels and commissions of business and education leaders discussing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

the problems that this mismatch has created. All of these calls for increased scrutiny and improved assessment and effectiveness measures come at a critical time—funds are shrinking, demands for and expectations of higher education are increasing, and costs are escalating. The critical juncture cannot be ignored: colleges must either embrace the effectiveness tiger or be eaten by it!

Not an Easy Embrace

Embrace will not be comfortable; it requires that colleges look squarely in the face of daunting tasks and take them on. *Embracing the Tiger* draws a clear picture of the contemporary scene and confirms at least some suspicions that the literature and casual observations raise. Through our own survey results, a study of the current literature, and in-depth descriptions of some existing programs with solid reputations for successful implementation, we came to the following conclusions:

(1) Colleges are making some progress toward developing effectiveness plans and programs. However, the progress is curiously slow, especially given the wealth of information that has been accumulated over the last decade.

(2) One potential reason for the lack of significant progress is that a common definition of institutional effectiveness is not currently available and remains elusive; even though relatively common terms appeared consistently in answers to survey questions and in program/plan descriptions, they were often used interchangeably, as though they were synonymous—when, in fact, they are not. And although there are some common parameters and components to existing effectiveness plans that could be adapted by other institutions, the best definition of institutional effectiveness is that drawn by each individual college, allowing for inclusion and reflection of the college's unique characteristics.

(3) Community college leaders are facing a serious challenge. It is apparent that a major barrier to creating and implementing an effectiveness plan is the college staff itself. Responses from individuals most familiar with the history of their effectiveness plans and programs consistently described a myriad of situations in which the hesitancy, initial concerns, weak commitment to total unwillingness, as well as outright sabotage by staff members delayed progress toward evaluating college practices. Leadership skills in creating a climate conducive to proving a college's effectiveness will be required and tested.

(4) The most critical barrier toward real progress in measuring effectiveness is an apparent misunderstanding, or an inability, on the part of colleges to make the critical link between mission and effectiveness! The conceptual frameworks most advanced in the literature prescribe linking college mission and expected outcomes in order to produce the most useful information a college needs to measure its effectiveness. Our survey data reveal that the overwhelming majority of colleges are not engaged in data collection activities that will indicate whether or not they are accomplishing their missions. Moreover, colleges report that selecting and designing appropriate effectiveness measures and determining how best to measure student learning are problematic.

Steps toward Embrace

The conclusions we drew from the data and descriptions in *Embracing the Tiger* should not be held up as proof that the embrace will be deadly. Frustrating as they are, the daunting challenges that the embrace offers are no greater than many others in the relatively youthful community college movement. Stepping up to the plate is a typical community college response, no matter the enormity of the task; since stepping up is in their best interests, colleges should welcome the opportunity to write their own history—the tiger's tale.

They can describe who they are, rather than be measured by the standards of others; they can draw a more realistic picture of their mission, not to be confused with the missions of others in the business of higher education. A stronger argument cannot be made for looking at who we are—the good and the bad—and making the next moves with excitement, tempered with precision. The public has been curiously patient, but its patience is wearing thin. It wants to know if a college truly is concerned about its community and its students, if a college actually wants to answer the question: What difference does it really make that the college is here?

There are colleges, many of them represented in *Embracing the Tiger*, whose experiences are hopeful signs that getting our collective arms around the issues of the effectiveness debate is mission possible. When colleges report on the extent and the extant of their accomplishments—and, in so doing, demonstrate that their missions are being accomplished—they will be telling a credible tale. It is a tale that the public wants to hear, it should be told, and community colleges are capable of telling it well.

John E. Roueche is professor and director of the Community College Leadership Program, and Sid W. Richardson Regents Chair in the Department of Educational Administration, the College of Education, at The University of Texas at Austin. Laurence F. Johnson is executive vice president of Terra Community College, Ohio. Suanne D. Roueche is director of the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD) and senior lecturer in the Department of Educational Administration, the College of Education, at The University of Texas at Austin.
Embracing the Tiger: The Effectiveness Debate and the Community College (Roueche, Johnson, Roueche, and Associates, 1997) is available from the Community College Press.

Volume 10, number 8
August 1997

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation.
Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

THE ADDICTIVE ORGANIZATION AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Sheila Ortega

Community colleges are serving the nation, providing a critical bridge for students seeking basic academic skills, comprehensive occupational training, and unique support services. The professionals in community colleges take pride in the fact that they help students to be successful. For the most part, students spill out of classrooms well educated, directed, and counseled. But can we say that we are entirely successful in our roles as leaders and educators?

A longstanding maxim in higher education is that education should teach students not only how to make a living, but also how to make a life. Recognizing that we all live in and through institutions—family, school, community, corporation—we must examine the model we are providing through our organizations, and question the example that we are setting for students.

In our role as leaders and teachers of present and future generations, the responsibility is uniquely ours to provide a good example, to be a powerful model of "wellness" in terms of institutional philosophy, structure, and operation. Are we indeed providing such a model, or are we repeating some of the traditional mistakes of American corporations?

This abstract will attempt to address the question of the community college organizational example by exploring the concept of addictive organizations and relating it to the community college context. In addition, it will provide some suggestions about how leaders might help community colleges—and by extension, their employees and students—overcome the dysfunctions associated with addictive organizations.

Attributes of Addictive Organizations

No educational system is immune from the ills that plague other businesses and bureaucracies. Because of this, community colleges sometime provide a mirror image of corporate life in America; and, the recent trends in total quality management and reengineering seem to be pushing colleges further in that direction. The challenge that comes with this push is that often the intended or unintended outcomes of processes like TQM or reengineering leave organizations distressingly far from providing answers to some of the more subtle yet critical problems of organizational life.

In *The Addictive Organization*, Anne Wilson Schaef and Diane Fassel tackle these issues by describing institutions which display all the standard symptoms of codependence. They claim that American business and industry is replete with examples of the symptoms listed below and, ironically, often it is the very change process meant to "fix" problems that leads to these organizational dysfunctions:

> Job descriptions are so broad that they are beyond normal human capacity, and people are rewarded for being workaholics;
>
> Employees feel that mistakes are unacceptable, and that they must deny them or cover them up;
>
> There is a prevalence of indirect communication. When in conflict, employees often avoid one another, carry tales to others, and only discuss problems with those who are powerless to help;
>
> The general philosophy is that everyone is part of "one big happy family," but membership in the family requires individuals to play rigid roles and to behave according to strict norms;
>
> Employees often feel the pressure of unwritten rules such as "Don't talk, Don't feel, Don't rock the boat."

If these characteristics sound familiar, it is not surprising. This type of organizational dysfunction may be more common than it is curable. But community college leaders cannot afford to ignore the problem. The dynamics of addictive organizations do violence to the effectiveness and potential of students as well as employees. When individuals try to survive and function within an addictive organization, they become addictive and codependent themselves and "act out" in all sorts of unhealthy ways. Some manifest their problems by imposing rigid, extreme, and perfectionistic requirements

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

on each other. Conversely, some display an indifference born out of stress. Others simply withdraw or deny any damaging effects at all.

Schaef and Fassel point out that educational institutions may be prime candidates for this type of dysfunction. They note that individuals who enter careers in public service are often idealistic and may be more vulnerable to the stresses that arise when faced with the dynamics of addictive organizations. Faculty and staff become unrealistic with students and force them to meet unattainable goals in the name of "standards." Others begin to disengage from the stress of the organization and focus more on outside interests, hobbies, or pursuits. Persuading these individuals to talk about substantive college issues is often a significant challenge. Finally, some college leaders will continue to charge ahead with programs or initiatives and almost aggressively deny any dysfunction exists at all—even in the face of large-scale organizational upheaval.

Healing Addictive Behavior

A close assessment of your organization may identify at least some of the dynamics of addictive organizations. Often, community college leaders can see the behaviors described here in many forms, acted out by many people—including themselves.

The situation, however, is far from hopeless. We have a choice of responses. One choice is to continue in denial and charge ahead, dysfunctions and all. Or, community college leaders can be true to their characteristically idealistic attitude and vote for the view that it is possible to foster, develop, and advance healthy organizations. In short, community colleges should strive to meet community needs while simultaneously nurturing intraorganizational "wellness."

The first step in the recovery of an addictive organization is the acknowledgment that a problem exists and the recognition that the organization, as well as the individuals within it, are going to have to change. Change is difficult. Outside experts might have to be called in to start the process or keep it in motion. Employees have to learn to recognize codependent behaviors within the organization and must also begin to design and implement strategies for healing. Throughout that process, codependent behaviors must be confronted and stopped. Schaef and Fassel recommend the following strategies for beginning the healing process:

> Leaders must learn to function as learners, sharing uncertainties and mistakes, encouraging others to search for new ideas, and creating an environment where it is safe for people to express themselves;
>
> Everyone should feel free to ask for support; personal goals should include: having an open attitude, being flexible, and nurturing creativity;
>
> Individuals should take responsibility for their own recovery from addictions and codependent behaviors, and should support the recovery of others;
>
> No one should be expected to cover up for anyone else's addictive or negative behaviors—whether the addict is in a powerful position or not;
>
> Multidirectional communication must be a priority—among all levels within and to those outside.

Those who are committed to change should begin to speak out and to ask for guidance as they struggle with old, destructive habits. College employees need to give each other permission to express feelings and thoughts, and work to overcome fears of retribution. Some argue that the traditional corporate model has provided us with a solid foundation for those fears; but without courage to overcome this sense of apprehension, a college team will restrict its ability to develop.

Conclusion

Even the most competitive businesses are beginning to realize that the old, rigid, secretive, and hierarchical paradigms are no longer functional. For those leaders who believe it is possible for community college organizations to become as healthy and successful as they consistently encourage their students to become, they can do no less than recognize that often systems become dysfunctional and take open and honest action to heal their institutions. Only then can community colleges provide a good and healthy example of organizational life to our students and to our community. And, perhaps then, we can say that we are truly successful in our roles as leaders and educators.

Sheila Ortega is the division head of Computer and Communication Technologies at Santa Fe Community College (NM) and is a North-Central Association Consultant/Evaluator. E-mail: jgilber2@ix.netcom.com

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691. (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

PROVIDING SHORT-TERM EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS: WELFARE REFORM AND ONE-STOP CENTERS

Alice Villadsen and Nick Gennett

Across the country, community colleges are working to help meet the growing challenge of moving individuals from welfare to work—quickly. Initiatives in welfare reform and consolidation of job-training and job-placement agencies are requiring community colleges to play key roles in developing what most states are calling "one-stop" career centers.

In states like North Carolina, community colleges are mandated players, the designated providers of short-term training options. In other states, community colleges are competing with various educational service providers to be the choice of sponsored students and agencies. In either case, numerous challenges face community colleges as they work to meet standard requirements of these initiatives: (1) designing programs with a minimum of 30 hours per week of instruction/work for students; (2) limiting program length to as little as six months; and (3) providing students in short-term training programs with opportunities for improving their wage-earning capacity. Moreover, even though the initial training may result in low-wage, entry-level jobs, the skills students learn must be a part of a career-ladder option leading to better wages through additional training.

At Central Piedmont Community College (NC), staff have been working with other agency partners to open a one-stop career center called *JobLink*. The agencies designated as mandatory participants in *JobLink* include the local community college, JTPA, Workfirst, Vocational Rehabilitation, Employment Security Commission, and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System. Under the direction of the Workforce Development Board, formerly the Private Industry Council, the six partners have consolidated services and staff into a shared office space; designed an intake/assessment/referral process; and are exploring the feasibility of opening satellite one-stops at area campuses of CPCC.

Additionally, the college designated an internal task force to develop short-term, open-entry/open-exit, and competency-based training programs that reflect local Employment Security Commission and CPCC projections about entry-level job requirements in the community. Examples of the initial 12 program areas include data-entry operator, receptionist/office skills, nurse aide, patient care technician, autobody helper, basic welding, light construction technology, and building cleaning specialist. These programs are designed to prepare completers for immediate employment as well as to link them to career ladder pathways to additional study or training that lead to higher-wage jobs.

Basic Program Components

Through local research with business and industry and a joint project with the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce and The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, CPCC discovered that local employers want employees who have good work ethics, solid basic skills, a positive attitude, some work experience, content competencies, and appropriate technical application skills. Research also indicated that local employers care little about classroom grades, seat time, and academic credentials. A CPCC task force used these findings to develop four essential components for all short-term training programs.

Content Skills. Students will learn the basics of the technical/vocational skill in six months or less. Instruction is self-paced and computer assisted, if applicable. Exit requirements are met before students are certified.

Basic Skills. After assessment in reading, writing, speech, math, and other appropriate basic skills, instruction mirrors specific industry standards in each of the 12 program areas. Requirements are met either through traditional classroom instruction, computer-based or computer-assisted options, or video coursework. Exit requirements are met before students are certified.

Workplace Readiness. Either through traditional instruction or locally developed video coursework, students are instructed in work values, workplace image and etiquette, adaptability, teamwork, interpersonal skills, attitude, time management, ethics, and conflict resolution.

Work-Based Learning. Six options for work-based learning are a part of the short-term training programs, including paid and unpaid cooperative education experiences, internships, clinical placements, adult apprenticeships, and job-shadowing activities.

Each of the initial 12 programs is "step one" in a career ladder leading to bright futures for participants. In addition, each program includes the practicality of immediate employment opportunities in the local market. The college plans to discontinue programs when employment needs abate and initiate new ones as necessary for emerging business/industry requests. Faculty have been using Instructional Performance Systems, Inc. software to develop the short-term programs. Curricula are competency-based and approved by appropriate advisory committees.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Advantages of Participation for Community Colleges

Experience with this initiative thus far has shown that participation in one-stop career centers and in the provision of short-term training for one-stop clients is "good for our students and good for our community"—the litmus test of all CPCC initiatives. Already, several advantages for participation have emerged:

- The college has worked with specific industries to develop the programs and to hire graduates, thereby increasing student enrollments in programs where employment is almost guaranteed.
- Through close work with local industries CPCC program viability is ensured, and the reputation of the college is enhanced.
- Faculty have begun to realize that nontraditional configurations of instruction are possible, indeed preferable, in some cases.
- Program outcomes are measurable, and students readily evaluate the success of their learning in the marketplace.
- Local taxpayers see immediacy in their investment in the local community college through workforce strength.
- The college competes with other training providers by offering more flexible programs.
- The college supports local economic development and meets the entry-level employment needs of the community.
- An enrollment stream for more advanced training certificates, diplomas, and associate degrees should result when the entry-level, short-term training programs are fully operational.
- A perfect *marketing strategy* for the college results when the person with a need for a job is matched with the employer with a need for entry-level workers.
- The college strengthens its position with other agency partners at the one-stop career center.
- The college becomes a key player in local business and industry recruitment efforts.

Suggestions Based On Early Experiences

Although many details regarding collaboration with agency partners, delivery of short-term training programs, job placement, and local employer satisfaction are still being worked out, we have already formulated some suggestions for colleges entering the short-term training environment in response to welfare reform and job services consolidation efforts.

- Colleges must have players at the table. The college should have representatives on the local Workforce Development Board and other related agencies. Other collaborative partnerships—with local chambers, manufacturers' councils, industry associations—ensure that the college will be immediately thought of as the primary local "workforce developer."
- Colleges must have developed collaborative relationships with key agencies, like the Employment Security Commission, the Department of Labor, Department of Commerce, JTPA, Vocational Rehabilitation, and the entire local educational establishment, from K-12 through the universities.
- Colleges must be willing to invest in program development and one-stop staffing costs. These investments will result in dividends for the college and the community.
- Internal support from the college president and the chief instructional and student support officers is essential to program success. Faculty and counselors must see that the college's involvement is important to the college leadership.
- All players must be ready for the "long haul." The development of short-term training programs and one-stop-career-center collaboration requires a new mentality of collaboration, both internally at the community college and externally among agencies, many of which are accustomed to having clearly defined turfs.
- Identifying and integrating funding streams from multiple agency partners within the one-stop center is critical, as is clearly defining requirements for client service eligibility. Compiling a comprehensive flowchart of one-stop services available for all categories of clients will help partners accurately counsel and efficiently refer clients within the center.

Conclusion

The stakes are high. Welfare reform and other emerging federal and state workforce consolidation legislation point to new imperatives for community colleges wishing to protect our historical role as premier providers of postsecondary job training. Failure to respond by adapting our training methods will leave the field to more entrepreneurial training providers.

Perhaps even more important, new training mandates call us to question and enlarge our traditional missions of providing transfer education and career programs based on college credit. The university approach of measuring education based on seat-time, grades, and degrees is obviously not the flexible one needed for the emerging sponsored students and many other down-sized, entrepreneurial, or transitioning students/workers. As community college leaders we must have the vision to engage our institutions in meeting the welfare-to-work challenge, the challenge of collaborating with community partners to prepare entry-level workers for the new century.

Alice Villadsen is the Vice President for Instruction and Nick Gennett is the Vice President for Educational Support Services at Central Piedmont Community College (NC). They can be contact at ***Alice_Villadsen@cpcc.cc.nc.us*** and ***Nick_Gennett@cpcc.cc.nc.us*** *respectively.*

Volume 10, number 10
October 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

HIGH SCHOOL AIN'T WHAT IT USED TO BE

Sandy Acebo

If you would not be forgotten,
As soon as you are dead and rotten,
Either write things worth reading,
Or do things worth the writing.
-Ben Franklin

With this memorable little verse, a student at Independence High School in San Jose, California, opens a digital "paper" on Benjamin Franklin, complete with downloaded color images from the Internet, as part of his "great leaders project." His assignment was to compose a piece about a great leader who integrated knowledge of technology, art, history, and business; he picked Ben, a man of invention, a statesman, and a businessman. Ben would have been at home in Silicon Valley, and so are the students doing this particular assignment. They are members of Corporate Academy 2000, a school-within-a-school for freshmen and sophomores at Independence who want to prepare for careers in finance, marketing, accounting, retailing, and stock brokerage. As juniors and seniors, they study these subjects with local business leaders who provide guidance, advice, internships, and encouragement to go on to college.

This is not the high school that most of us remember, nor is it a posh prep school. Independence High School is a public high school with a large and diverse student population from some of San Jose's poorest neighborhoods, enrolling over 2,300 language minority students in a total student population of 4,000. Under the leadership of Principal John Sellarole, not only has the structure of the school been changed to create smaller, more student-friendly centers focused on careers, but also the entire faculty have been trained in specific strategies known to improve student learning; and teacher evaluations consistently assess how well those strategies are implemented. After initiating a number of schoolwide structural and pedagogical reforms with a considerable amount of internal struggle, Independence has watched its graduation rate steadily increase from 66.5 percent in 1992 to 85 percent in 1996.

And where will these students go next? The likelihood is high that many will come to community colleges. And just as those of us in the community colleges begin to address the reality that the Nintendo generation is at the door, perhaps we should also take note that graduates of newly reformed high schools are also coming our way with different experiences and expectations of how schools should function. As we make progress in creating what Terry O'Banion calls *A Learning College for the 21st Century* and look to the exciting initiatives at Palomar, Sinclair, Maricopa, Lane, Jackson, and the Community College of Denver, we might also do well to look at the high school next door.

One High School's Story of Reform

Next door to De Anza College are a number of schools like Independence that have passed the stringent entry standards required to join what is called the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative (BASRC), or "bazz-ric." The Collaborative was set in motion in 1993 by Walter Annenberg's $500 million effort to improve public education. Annenberg Challenge funds were offered to the "most urban" and the "most rural" areas which could muster matching funds and a structure to address the overarching goals of the Annenberg Challenge. These include not only goals for individual school reform, but an even broader vision: creating networks of member schools to help one another, provoking larger district and state systems to provide enough autonomy and flexibility for individual school reform, and mobilizing local political and business groups to help sustain reform and spread best practices.

A change initiative of this magnitude requires important friends with an ongoing interest in education and community development. BASRC is supported by $25 million from William R. Hewlett and the Hewlett Foundation, matched by $25 million from the Annenberg Foundation. Other national and Bay Area foundations provide additional support. BASRC is a massive endeavor, spanning 800,000 students in over 1,200 public schools from 118 school districts across six San Francisco Bay Area counties. Comparable but locally defined Annenberg Challenge initiatives are under way in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and Philadelphia.

Independence is a leadership school in BASRC, as is Homestead High School a few miles away in the California community of Cupertino. Homestead has been in the process of reinventing itself since 1990 and was one of the first to receive funding under the Hewlett-Annenberg Challenge.

Homestead has 1,750 students, 46 percent of whom are ethnic minorities speaking 28 different native languages—a typical school by San Francisco Bay Area standards. Their reform efforts, led by a school site team and Principal David Payne, followed comprehensive staff, student, and parent surveys evaluating the school. The surveys showed general confidence in the school, but low satisfaction with

opportunities for truly challenging learning experiences that involve in-depth understanding and the application of knowledge to real-world experience. A series of community forums attended by over 500 people revealed that both students and teachers were feeling isolated. Many students were bored, just "putting in time." Students and their parents complained about the lack of opportunity for the students to relate to an adult mentor or to receive appropriate counseling. Even the top students devoted most of their energy to manipulating the system in order to crank out good grades for entry into prestigious colleges. Parents were interested in reform but made it clear that any changes could not jeopardize their children's chances for acceptance at colleges and universities, including the most selective ones.

Principal Payne created a site leadership team, composed of teachers, staff, and students, to discuss the results of the survey and share them with the school, the district, parents, and the community. Ultimately, the site leadership team decided that tinkering with existing structures was not enough—deep and systemic change was needed.

In the 1994-95 school year, following a 75 percent vote of approval by the faculty, Homestead eliminated the traditional 50-minute class period for students who volunteered for a new system, and in its place created interdisciplinary "houses" characterized by a distinctive theme, focus, or approach. These houses also became home for groups of students shared among teaching teams for extended time blocks. The concerns of parents were met by maintaining traditional course numbers and curriculum outlines.

One of Homestead's most significant achievements, assisted by the California Center for School Restructuring (now the Pacific Educational Group) has been to persuade the University of California to accept student portfolios, rather than traditional course grades, as transcripts. The portfolio evaluates student performance in specific classes according to competencies, rather than test scores or rewards for homework or attendance. Those competencies are **communication**, including reading and writing, listening and speaking with diverse audiences; **habits of mind**, including complex thinking, critical thinking, creative thinking, and information processing; and **habits of work**, including collaboration and self-monitoring. Portfolio completion also includes what we would recognize as the more traditional **in-depth mastery of content**. The graduation portfolio includes assessment of an "exhibition" to tie the student's work together and showcase a summation of that student's knowledge and skills.

The reform leaders at Homestead will be first to tell you how difficult it has been to change such long-standing, deep-rooted, and closely held norms as the independent teacher, the 50-minute class, and the course grade based on subject matter tests. Nevertheless, the site leadership team is determined to stay the course. Recently, the co-chair of the group, a student at Homestead High School, gave a luncheon address to hundreds of participants at a BASRC assembly. On a huge auditorium stage facing a large crowd of teachers, politicians, foundation people, and reporters, with the television cameras fixed on her, she calmly explained the political nuances of reform, the skills in adjudication and conflict resolution required, the importance of professionals treating each other with respect, and the consequences for students when they do not. It was not only the quality of her speech that brought down the house, but the fact that a high school student was trusted to make it.

Consequences for the Community Colleges

How likely are we to see students from high schools like this at our colleges? Many of them are already with us, some concurrently enrolled. More will be coming if we do our jobs right.

Granted, the number of high schools undergoing whole-school reform is relatively small, but their normative influence is significant. As a consequence of such courage and innovation, we can expect more intellectually active students who believe they should think for themselves, take responsibility for their learning, and work collaboratively for improved outcomes. They will come to the community college looking for such collaboration among their instructors and will anticipate that linkages have been made to join subjects to be studied in some coherent way. They will expect their instructors to know them and to know that someday, whether or not they complete a higher degree, they are likely to have a job. Thus, they will continue to be interested in the relationship between what they are learning and the world of work. They will believe that teachers truly interested in teaching and learning will have a good understanding of what the learning process entails, including attention to cultural difference and differences in learning style. Beyond Nintendo, these students will expect that their creative application of technology in projects will be welcomed and matched by comparable creativity in course design by their college instructors.

High school ain't what it used to be. And, as we search for partners willing to undertake systemic reform to improve learning, we should be sure to include and perhaps even model our longtime partners, the local high schools.

Dr. Sandy Acebo is Vice President for Instruction at De Anza College in Cupertino, California. She is a graduate of the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin and the Executive Leadership Institute of the League for Innovation. She can be contacted via e-mail at ***acebo@admin.fhda.edu*** .

Volume 10, number 11
November 1997

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

RESOURCES FOR LEADERS

From the Editor

Each year, the League for Innovation in the Community College offers a range of publications, programs, and services for community college leaders. In an effort to highlight these resources, this year-end issue of *Leadership Abstracts* profiles a number of key League offerings from 1997. More information on each of the following resources is available online through the League's Web site at http://www.league.org or through the League office at (714) 367-2884.

Executive Leadership Institute (ELI)

The Executive Leadership Institute (ELI) provides an opportunity for potential community college presidents to review their abilities and interests, refine their skills, and participate in discussions on leadership with outstanding community college leaders in North America.

This weeklong institute is conducted by the League in cooperation with The University of Texas at Austin and is designed to build a network among participants, leading community college presidents, and representatives of major community college presidential search firms.

Expanding Leadership Diversity (ELD) Program

The League's ELD program assists promising community college midlevel managers and faculty of varied ethnic and racial origins in achieving senior-level leadership positions in community colleges. The program includes goal setting, guided professional development activities, significant experiential and self-directed learning, and opportunities to network with and learn from peers and community college leaders. During the course of the program, participants (1) develop mentor relationships and a professional development plan, (2) attend two intensive weeklong seminars on the campuses of League colleges, (3) complete a community issue project, and (4) participate in an internship experience.

League Publications

As part of its ongoing initiatives, the League produces monographs and other publications useful to the community college leader. A complimentary copy of each of the following publications has been sent to member colleges. Additional copies are available through the League's online bookstore at http://www.league.org/leagpubs.html or by calling Susan Walton at (714) 367-2884.

Creating More Learning-Centered Community Colleges

This monograph outlines six basic principles that undergird the author's concept of "The Learning College," shares experiences of six institutions that have launched their journey toward becoming learning colleges, and explores key issues and challenges colleges will encounter if they decide to become more learning centered.

Developing Professional Fitness Through Classroom Assessment and Classroom Research, The Cross Papers, Number 1

In this first issue of a new annual series in which K. Patricia Cross highlights key community college innovations, the author reviews the basic characteristics of Classroom Assessment and Classroom Research and makes a strong case for applying these concepts in community college classrooms as an innovative breakthrough in reform efforts, professional development, and increased learning for students.

Workforce, Economic, and Community Development: The Changing Landscape of the Entrepreneurial Community College

This joint publication of the League, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and National Council for Occupational Education, examines (1) community colleges' new roles in workforce development, economic development, and community development; and (2) the emerging concept of the entrepreneurial college.

The Technology and Learning Community (TLC): http://www.leaguetlc.org

The Technology and Learning Community (TLC) is a League Web site dedicated to the exploration of the use of information technology in community college teaching and learning, student services, and institutional management. TLC features (1) a complete ***Online Bookstore*** with key community college publications, (2) a ***Conference Center*** for League events, (3) a ***Public Information Center*** with lead articles and model programs, and (4) the ***Partner Place***, where leading information technology companies describe joint programs and services. Finally, the heart of TLC is the interactive ***Community Center*** which features (1) online discussion groups exploring important community college technology and learning issues; and (2) a comprehensive and searchable member and innovation database, facilitating easy access to people and model programs from around the world.

Volume 10 and Other Selected Leadership Abstracts

Each of the issues listed below is available online at http://www.league.org/leadabst.html

1997

Community Colleges Winning Through Innovation: Taking on the Changes and Choices of Leadership in the Twenty-First Century, Mark D. Milliron & Ernest Leach, Special Edition, 1997

High School Ain't What It Used to Be, Sandy Acebo, Vol. 10, No. 11, November 1997

Providing Short-Term Educational Programs: Welfare Reform and One-Stop Centers, Alice Villadsen & Nick Gennett, Vol. 10, No. 10, October 1997

The Addictive Organization and the Community College, Sheila Ortega, Vol. 10, No. 9, September 1997

Embracing the Tiger: The Institutional Effectiveness Challenge, John E. Roueche, Laurence F. Johnson, & Suanne D. Roueche, Vol. 10, No. 8, August 1997

The Purpose, Process, and Product of the Learning Revolution in the Community College, Terry O'Banion, Vol. 10, No. 7, July 1997

Building Community from the Inside Out, Stephen K. Mittelstet & Gerardo E. de los Santos, Vol. 10, No. 6, June 1997

Community College Leadership in the Age of Technology, Steven Lee Johnson, Vol. 10, No. 5, May 1997

Both Sides Now: Perspectives on Community College Workforce Development, Ruth G. Shaw, Vol. 10, No. 4, April 1997

From Castles in the Air to Classrooms on the Campus: Using Collaboration to Develop Facilities, Lynn Sullivan Taber, Vol. 10, No. 3, March 1997

The Community College Niche in a Competitive Higher Education Market, Don Doucette, Vol. 10, No. 2, February 1997

On Community College Renewal, Nathan L. Hodges and Mark D. Milliron, Vol. 10, No. 1, January 1997

1996

The Challenge of Board Change, George R. Boggs, Vol. 9, No. 10, October 1996

Learning Communities, Learning Organizations, and Learning Colleges, Terry O'Banion, Vol. 9, No. 8, August 1996

Technology as a Metaphor for Change, Kenneth C. Green, Vol. 9, No. 7, July 1996

Leading the Multicultural Community College, Augustine P. Gallego, Vol. 9, No. 5, May 1996

Community College Leadership in the New Century, Gunder Myran, Tony Zeiss, and Linda Howdyshell, *Vol. 9, No. 2, February 1996*

1995

Who Are Community Colleges' Distance Learners?, Carol Cross, Vol. 8, No. 10, October 1995

Can Community Colleges Do the Job?, Robert A. (Squee) Gordon, Vol. 8, No. 8, August 1995

Don't Miss the Joy!, Dale Parnell, Vol. 8, No. 7, July 1995

Mission Possible: Teaching the Disenfranchised, J. William Wenrich, Vol. 8, No. 6, June 1995

The College President, the Board, and the Board Chair: a Primer on Effective Relationships, Wayne Newton and Norm Nielsen, *Vol. 8, No. 2, February 1995*

Redesigning the System to Meet the Workforce Training Needs of the Nation, Larry Warford, Vol. 8, No. 1, January 1995

Volume 10, number 12
December 1997

Mark D. Milliron, Editor
Leadership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

Printed on Recycled Paper

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.